



3644

Application No.: 09/922,376 Examiner: Smith, Kimberly S.
Applicant: Jeffrey Lynn Chamberlain GAU: 3644
Filed: 08/03/2001 Office Action Date: 05/05/2003
For: Dog Watering Toy

TRANSMITTAL

Transmitted herewith please find Jeffrey Chamberlain's Response to the May 5, 2003 Office Action in the above referenced application. Mr. Chamberlain has submitted his amendments in the optional revised format involving page breaks at each section of the response. He has also provided a clean version of the specification.

Respectfully submitted:

Charles R. Sutton

Charles R. Sutton Reg. No. 42,176
(818) 780-6616

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on August 5, 2003

Charles R. Sutton Reg. No. 42,176

Charles R. Sutton

RECEIVED

AUG 11 2003

GROUP 3600



Application No.: 09/922,376 Examiner: Smith, Kimberly S.

Applicant: Jeffrey Lynn Chamberlain GAU: 3644

Filed: 08/03/2001

For: Dog Watering Toy

RECEIVED
AUG 11 2003
GROUP 3600

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. section 102 on the grounds that the valve mechanisms disclosed by Deshaies (Patent No. 5,944,516) do not move "substantially perpendicular to said wall" and therefore are not the same structures disclosed by claims 7 and 8. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. section 103 on the grounds that the reference relied upon by the examiner teaches away from the invention herein and therefore this invention is non-obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. section 103 on the grounds that the primary reference relied upon by the examiner teaches away from the invention herein and therefore this invention is non-obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5 and 13 on the grounds that the primary reference relied upon by the examiner teaches away from the invention herein and therefore this invention is non-obvious. Applicant requests that the examiner reconsider these rejections and withdraw them. Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 11. Applicant also amends the specification.

12/B
8/14/03
Hollins